

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/383,560

Applicant(s)  
RUSIN

Examiner  
Ralph Lewis

Group Art Unit  
3732

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ralph Lewis

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Steven Skolnick

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 16, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: the pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

the cited art - applicant brought in commercial brochures of the materials cited in the specification

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

As to the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph - applicant explained that Table 2 was just an example and that the materials were capable of the higher strength values - the examiner agreed to withdraw the rejection when the argument was formally submitted. As to the prior art rejections - the examiner generally indicated that the "dental mill blank" claims were interpreted as being directed primarily toward a block of specific material and that it was of little patentable distinction as to what the blocks were intended to be carved into. The examiner indicated that claims directed to the method of manufacturing might be more persuasive in overcoming the art of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

  
Ralph A. Lewis  
Primary Examiner  
Au3732

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.